R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 019 517 95 VT 005 648

SUMMER INSTITUTE FOR VOCATIONAL COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE PERSONNEL (FITCHBURG, MASSACHUSETTS, NOVEMBER 28, 1966).

BY- COOKE, LOT H., JR. MORINE, JOHN P.

REPORT NUMBER BR-6-2347 PUB DATE 28 NOV 66

GRANT OEG-1-6-062347-0712

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.28 30P.

DESCRIPTORS- *SUMMER INSTITUTES, *GUIDANCE PERSONNEL, *VOCATIONAL COUNSELING, PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, *URBAN YOUTH, PROGRAM EVALUATION, QUESTIONNAIRES,

THIRTY-FOUR PUBLIC SCHOOL GUIDANCE COUNSELORS FROM SIX NEW ENGLAND STATES, NEW YORK, AND NEW JERSEY PARTICIPATED IN AN INSTITUTE TO BECOME ACQUAINTED WITH THE PROBLEMS AND SPECIAL TECHNIQUES INVOLVED IN COUNSELING THE URBAN DISADVANTAGED STUDENT. THE PROGRAM CONSISTED OF LECTURES BY OUTSTANDING AUTHORITIES IN THE FIELD, LIMITED DISCUSSION PERIODS, VISITS TO LOCAL INDUSTRY AND VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS, AND ACTUAL PRACTICE IN TECHNIQUES SUCH AS JOB ANALYSIS. THIRTY-THREE PARTICIPANTS RESPONDED TO A QUESTIONNAIRE WHICH REQUESTED THEIR REACTIONS TO THE INSTITUTE. IN GENERAL, THE PARTICIPANTS FELT THAT THEY HAD RECEIVED MUCH BENEFIT FROM THE INSTITUTE, BUT CLAIMED THAT IT HAD FEATURED TOO MANY LECTURES, LEFT TOO LITTLE TIME FOR DISCUSSION AND PRACTICE, AND LEFT THEM SKETCHILY PREPARED TO ACTUALLY EMPLOY THE NEW TECHNIQUES IN SCHOOL SITUATIONS. THE BACKGROUND OF THE INSTITUTE, PURPOSES, METHODS OR PROCEDURES, AND RESULTS ARE DISCUSSED. A LIST OF LECTURERS, INSTITUTE ACTIVITY SCHEDULE, PARTICIPANT APPLICATION FORM, QUESTIONNAIRE FORM, AND A TABLE OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS ARE GIVEN IN THE APPENDIX. (PS)

ED019517

INTERIM REPORT
Project No. 6-2347
Grant No. OEG-1-6-062347-0712

SUMMER INSTITUTE

FOR

VOCATIONAL COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE PERSONNEL

November 28, 1966

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

VT005648

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SUMMER INSTITUTE

FOR

VOCATIONAL COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE PERSONNEL

Project No. 6-2347
Grant No. OEG-1-6-062347-0712

Prepared by:

Lot H. Cooke, Jr., Senior Supervisor
John P. Morine, Senior Supervisor
Bureau of Vocational Education
State Department of Education
Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Philip A. McMurray, Institute Director
William H. Fitzgibbon, Principal Investigator
State College at Fitchburg

November 28, 1966

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

State College

Fitchburg, Massachusetts

INTRODUCTION

Background of Institute - During the past several years, two trends of paramount importance for occupational guidance counselors and administrators have developed. First, vocational education has increasingly been perceived as the primary means by which socio-economically disadvantaged students can ultimately improve their chances for success in the American culture. Second, vocational, or to be more precise, occupational, education is being offered in a widening variety of American secondary and post-secondary schools.

These two new factors, plus two older and continuing ones - proliferation of occupational offerings to keep pace with rapid industrial development and change; and, an equally rapid increase in both the amount and variety of research concerning methods of improving occupational information and guidance - have placed a considerable burden on the average school guidance counselor and administrator, particularly those in depressed urban locales suffering from assorted educational insufficiencies. By what means can the new developments be transmitted and explained to them, and what are their implications for future programs designed to aid the "disadvantaged," specifically?

During the Summers of 1964 and 1965, the State College at Fitchburg, Massachusetts, and the Massachusetts Bureau of Vocational Education, had jointly conducted programs in occupational guidance for teachers and counselors located within the Commonwealth. These programs, however, were not specifically concerned with guidance for disadvantaged youth. However, it occurred to the above parties that a number of the excellent lecturers who were already contributing to these sessions had also been recently directing a portion of their efforts toward this problem area. For example, Dr. William Kvaraceus of the Tufts University Lincoln Filene Center had been a prime mover in the Phi Delta Kappa symposium on disadvantaged youth and delinquincy and had presented a paper on the topic at the Governor's Conference on Poverty.

State College and Vocational Bureau staff members also felt that they had a responsibility to disseminate some of this information to the other New England States, in hopes of promoting a mutual understanding of each other's problems and, possibly, enhancing existing efforts to form a joint approach to these problems in the New England region.

Problem - Briefly, the problem, as defined by the project initiators, was as follows: To reach the overburdened and underprepared guidance counselor in depressed urban areas, to introduce him to the means for attacking his expanding problems, and to devise means for assessing the operational impact of such training after the counselor returned to his school.

Purposes Of Institute - The purposes of the Institute - which are synonymous with the general methods established by the grantees for conducting the Institute - were to:

1. Present a comprehensive course in modern occupational and personal guidance, aimed at the public school counselor to the urban disadvantaged, and delivered by recognized leaders in the field who work primarily in Massachusetts.

2. Develop, during the Summer Institute, a framework for assessing the impact of this instruction on the individual counselor and, later, on occupational guidance practices in his school.

3. From Steps (1) and (2), compile recommendations for the content and conduct of future guidance seminars, and for further related research and/or training steps which may enhance the effectiveness of joint Federal-State action in the occupational guidance field.

METHODS OR PROCEDURES

Administrative Mechanisms - In line with the decision implied by the last paragraph of the "Background" section on page two, the grantee requested the Massachusetts State Director of Vocational Education to notify his counterparts in the six New England States, plus New York and New Jersey, of the Institute and its purposes, and to recruit their assistance in selecting forty participants from these States. Generally, this selection process was to be achieved by notices mailed to schools in urban areas carefully selected by the State Directors and by advertisements placed in newspapers serving these same areas. The State Directors were supplied with information sheets and application forms to be distributed to persons in their respective States who showed interest. The State Directors and their guidance staff then were to screen these applications and send the list of eligible applicants to the grantees. The latter were then to combine the eight lists and choose the final list on

the basis of (a) future ability to implement and, particularly, to disseminate the information to be received in the Institute and (b) an equitable distribution among the eight States involved. Successful applicants were to receive a complete brochure describing the Institute program and mechanics of attendance.

Generally, Institute functions were divided as follows: the State College members of the Institute staff were to handle the administrative details and the Vocational Bureau personnel were to design the program, recruit lecturers, devise questionnaires to assess participant reactions, but either were free to exchange functions whenever such effort was deemed by both to be in the interest of improving the program.

Program Preparation - The Institute design essentially involved adapting the program which had previously been presented during the two previous Summers at Fitchburg State. Features of this program were:

1. Recruitment of experts in the occupational guidance field. Among these were:

Dugald S. Arbuckle, Boston University
David S. Tiedman, Harvard University
William C. Kvaraceus, Tufts University
Robert O'Hara, Boston College
Edward Landy, Newton Public Schools and Harvard University
James J. Hammond, President, State College at Fitchburg
Joseph Mindel, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Maybelle Northcott, Division of Employment Security
Wallace J. Fletcher, Newton Public Schools

NOTE: The full list of Institute lecturers and instructors appears as Appendix A of this report.

2. Arrangements with two companies, generally considered to be among the more progressive, efficiently organized industries in the Worcester area wherein participants could be given practical instruction in, as well as apply themselves to, the techniques of job analysis. These firms were:

The Norton Company (an Abrasive Manufacturing Plant)
The Heald Machine Company

3. Cooperation was secured from the Worcester Industrial Technical Institute to arrange for an orientation visit by the participants. The purpose of this visit was to present the participants with an on-site demonstration of the many opportunities available in post-secondary occupational education, to acquaint them with the level of student competence which was required in such an institution and, in later discussions, to analyze the problems in guiding disadvantaged students into such education, as well as the many additional problems in equipping them to pursue it successfully.

4. The Fitchburg State College members of the Institute team secured the necessary housing and dining facilities for the expected number of participants, aided in the selection of participants, introduced speakers, and established the various administrative mechanisms of space, reimbursement, et cetera.

5. Regarding preparations for analyzing the results of the Institute, the grantees at first thought to devise a pilot questionnaire midway in the program for distribution to the participants immediately after the final class was concluded. However, this step was postponed until the last few days, for the following reasons: First, the way the Institute developed might make some parts of such a pre-constructed questionnaire unnecessary and might ignore other features which could not be anticipated; second, it was decided to enlist the active cooperation of the participants in designing the entire questionnaire since this approach might encourage a higher percentage of replies, as well as more complete replies; last, it had already been planned to solicit suggestions from participants regarding the second questionnaire which would attempt to determine how Institute ideas had been implemented in the participants' school situations. Therefore, all of these inquiries were combined into one questionnaire which was worked out during the Institute's final hours with the assistance of staff and participants alike. This initial questionnaire is appended to this report. The final questionnaire, which will provide material and recommendations for the report due on 1 March 1967, will be developed from suggestions in the first replies and has not yet been completed. The initial questionnaire appears as Appendix D of this report.

6. The Institute staff considered the problem of whether the questionnaires should be subjected to any kind of statistical analysis; also, whether any conclusions might be drawn from matching participant replies with various background factors

which could be ascertained from the application forms, shown as Appendix C of this report.

It was decided, first, that research methods of this sort were largely inapplicable to short training institutes of the kind programmed for Fitchburg State College. The small number of participants would also necessitate the use of highly sophisticated statistical techniques of rather uncertain validity. A chart could be prepared which might show trends or a consensus on major features of the Institute (shown as Appendix E of this report), but the main purposes of the questionnaire were to (a) give the Institute staff some general feedback which would help them to develop better programs in the future; and (b) serve as a device whereby the participants could organize their experiences and their plans for implementation of techniques offered during the course of instruction. Formal analysis of the questionnaire would not significantly contribute to either of these objectives.

RESULTS

Preliminary Note - The term "result" is somewhat inapt when used in connection with a training institute. Ultimately, the results of a successful program should be increased competence of the participants, increased use of the Institute-taught techniques in their local situations, and dissemination of these ideas to others who might use them. The first result can not be directly measured. The second will be assessed in the second report of this series, after return of the final questionnaire. The third will be attempted through distribution of an expanded combined version of the two reports to the USOE to participants, lecturers, State Vocational Directors of the eight States involved, and their Occupational Guidance Directors. This full report will include reprints of Institute lectures which are judged to have greatest pertinence for the prospective user. It is now in preparation, but will not be available until mid-Spring, 1967.

This interim report, as originally planned, summarizes the activities of the Institute, details the Staff's conclusions regarding its accomplishments, and includes the initial reactions of the participants. The second and final report will assess impact, in terms of participant use of Institute techniques, and will offer recommendations for the conduct of future institutes of this type and, possibly, for better mechanisms of State-Federal collaboration in the field as well as for needed research.

The Institute activities have been briefly summarized in an earlier section of this report and appear in full as Appendix B. There was no deviation from this schedule. Interim or tentative conclusions of the Institute staff appear in a later section and, consequently, the remainder of this section will be devoted to the questionnaire responses.

Initial Survey Results

(Part A, Subsection 1)

Npte: 33 out of 34 responding

1a - Concerning favoring heterogenous over homogenous selection of participants:

Result: 32 for and 1 against heterogenous grouping
Main reason: greater opportunity for interchange of ideas and mutual understanding of diverse problems; some complaints from experienced counselors, who felt that several topics were handled in an overly elementary manner.

1b(1)- Concerning number of speakers, amount of information in lectures, and time allowed for discussion:

Results: 27 felt there were too many speakers, 6 (enough) and 0 (too few).
1 felt that too much information was given for practical school purposes, 16 (enough) and 15 (too little).
0 felt that too much time had been allowed for informal discussion of points raised during lectures, 5 (enough), and 28 (too little).

1b(2)- Concerning course scope, level of instruction, and intensity of instruction

Results: 1 felt that the course scope was too comprehensive, 32 (broad enough), and 0 (too limited).
0 felt that the level of instruction was too high, 31 (high enough), and 1 (too low).

7 felt that the intensity of instruction was too strong, 25 (manageable) and 1 (too weak).

Main Criticism: That the course content was so far-ranging that it was not always relevant to the Institute purpose of focusing on the disadvantaged.

1b(3)- Concerning, generally, professional contact - including time allotted to participants for discussion among themselves, and time allotted for participants to discuss specific problems (not necessarily lecture points) with instructors on an individual or small-group basis.

Results: 0 felt that too great an amount of time had been allotted for discussion among themselves, either in or out of class, 9 (enough), and 24 (too little).
0 felt that too great an amount of time had been allotted for contact with the lecturers, 6 (enough), and 27 (too little).

1b(4)- Concerning the possible advantage of sending participants more advance content materials, as an aid to preparation for the Institute

Result: 19 felt that this would be desirable, and 12 felt that it would not.

Main Reasons: Those responding affirmatively stated that they did not require advance study materials so much as they would have liked more information on the backgrounds and philosophies of the lecturers, as well as a somewhat fuller explanation of the topics to be covered. Those replying negatively pointed out that the June closing rush of school affairs would not have allowed much time for preparation in any event, since the Institute followed this closing so immediately.

1b(5)- Concerning the number of field trips to local industries and the length of follow-up discussions for these trips

Results: 1 felt that there were too many field trips, 23 (enough), and 7 (too few)
8 felt that the follow-up discussions of these trips were too long, 14 (enough), and 9 (too short)

Main Criticisms: That both industries were of the same type and that the second trip could have been to a health or service-type industry (or institution); and that more time could have been scheduled for inspection of area vocational-technical schools. However, the job analysis instruction and practice were judged almost unanimously to have been very useful.

1c - Concerning the utility (least and most) of instruction and the aspects of the vocational guidance counselor's role which had changed in the perception of the participant; Note: Out of fairness to the lecturers, no specific results will be quoted for the first question; and, since the second question allowed the respondent to use his own terminology, only overall impressions will be stated.

Results: In general, the participants seemed to find three topics of special interest - (1) the general discussions of the problems of disadvantaged students; (2) the Harvard-NEEDS computerized guidance project; and (3) the Newton project (State-financed) for establishing a small occupational guidance center. Other topics mentioned favorably included Counseling for Placement, the experiences of vocational-technical instructors, the Arlington STEP program, Psychological Testing in Industry, Placement Follow-up Project (also Newton), and Careers for the Future. Also in general, the participants listed four lectures as being of least estimated use: (1) The Dictionary of Occupational Titles; (2) the analysis of occupations; (3) Higher Education Overseas; and (4) Surveying Industry to Determine Occupational Needs. Other topics mentioned unfavorably include the Educational and Cultural Implications of Technological Change, Shop Application of Projects, and a discussion of the M.I.T. Vocational Education Summer Study.

In general, two points are noteworthy concerning the participants' changed view of the vocational guidance counselor's role: (1) Although the respondent was given the option of listing aspects of either greater or lesser importance to him, the replies concentrated almost exclusively on aspects which had assumed greater importance, with emphasis on the need for employing special techniques in guiding the disadvantaged; and (2) the only aspect which was singled out as being less important was the present emphasis on counseling the college-bound student. Other functions which were mentioned as having greater importance were: Getting across to students the idea of highly developed skill requirements in most industries; responsibility of counselor to familiarize himself with local industry and its requirements; working closely with local employment services; making occupational information more up-to-date and, especially, more easily accessible to the student; the need to coordinate high-school counseling with that in the junior high school, with emphasis on continuing pursuit of occupational understanding and decision processes.

The remainder of the questionnaire concerned plans for implementation of ideas and techniques garnered from the Institute sessions, plans for dissemination of these ideas and techniques, and recommendations for questions which should be asked in the second survey. The responses to these questions will be reflected in the second and final report, in which present plans and ultimate results will be placed in juxtaposition and resulting discrepancies analyzed.

DISCUSSION

Construction of the first questionnaire - As is the case with any such instrument, the one in question has flaws - mostly those which are inherent in any multiple-choice form. For example, the fact that almost all respondents felt that the course scope, level of instruction and intensity of instruction were "enough" actually conceals specific instances where the respondents' judgment may have been otherwise, since, in effect, an average opinion covering all topics was required. A number of respondents mentioned this difficulty. Another example is the use of the word, "intensity." To some, this meant the pace of instruction; to others, it meant the depth of instruction.

Therefore, because of this ambiguity, it was possible for a given respondent to judge the instruction to be simultaneously too intense (i.e. too fast) and too weak (i.e. too little depth, because of the rapid pace, itself). Finally, there was an obvious question as to what was meant by "enough" visits to local industry: Did this mean kind or quantity? These points are raised to warn the reader (as they have warned the Institute staff) not to be too complacent about the many replies which seem to imply that the Institute accomplished what it set out to accomplish. This conclusion must be reserved for the final report.

Conclusion of questionnaire - The Institute staff feels that one point made by the participants - not enough information about the lecturers' backgrounds, philosophies, and topics - should be explained further. The lateness of the Institute's approval by the USOE delayed the printing of advance material and dictated that it include only the bare necessities. In several cases, this decision jeopardized the appearance of scheduled lecturers, although none actually cancelled. However, the uncertainties involved mitigated against the fuller advance information which the staff agrees would have been desirable.

A second problem concerned the $75 stipend which the proposal originators were instructed not to allow and which (it was later learned) other institutes were offering: The expected equitable distribution of participants among the eight States involved did not materialize and too many participants had to be selected from Massachusetts. For example, no applications were received from New York, New Hampshire or Rhode Island, although they were solicited from these states. Sixty-five applications were received, in all, and forty-five were approved. Some of these rejected the acceptances since they had been forced to make other plans in the interval; others had anticipated a stipend. Because of numerous rejections, additional applications were transmitted to those whose inquiries were received after the cut-off date. Most of these were from Massachusetts. Of the forty finally chosen and who had sent acceptances, three did not appear, two more enrolled and immediately cancelled, and three more were forced to leave after two weeks' attendance; two had obtained new guidance positions which required moves out-of-State and one was forced to return home because of wife's illness.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The Institute staff feels that its original decisions concerning heterogeneity of participants and the survey nature of the course were justified.

2. However, the criticism that there were too many speakers is valid. The original strategy was based on the premise that diversity and speed of presentation was necessary to cover the many ramifications of working with the disadvantaged. An inevitable corollary to this was that too little time would be left to discuss the step-by-step "hows" which are necessary to implement the "whys." In passing, it should be noted that the staff did spend as much time as it thought possible on several practical techniques. These were presented in the visits to industries (e.g. job analysis), observation of vocational-technical school guidance, and examples of teaching situations in the crafts. Nevertheless, the main idea was to expose the participants to many new ideas, to expand their horizons as rapidly as possible - perhaps at the cost of thoroughness of preparation in any given method or practice. How effective this approach proves to be will be determined when questionnaires are received from the Institute participants during mid-February, 1967, after they have had approximately six months in which to try their own tactics and to aid their fellow counselors.

3. As far as this project has gone, the Institute staff judges that it has achieved at least partial, moderate success in reaching its objectives, as stated in the proposal. The one tentative change which has already been planned for future programs of this type (note: final recommendations will be made in the second report) is to reduce the number of speakers, to devote more time to small-group discussion with several lecturers joining in panels and with the groups led by a moderator, and to increase emphasis on the more practical "hows" - perhaps by setting up typical situations with selected disadvantaged students, and by role-playing exercises.

4. The major worry which the Institute staff now faces is that the participants have been "left on their own" too soon. Hopefully, expert help will be available to them from their local supervisors and guidance directors. Also, the Institute staff, including the lecturers, have limited time in which to offer assistance. However, since we do feel responsibility of some kind, letters will shortly be sent to participants (well in advance of the second questionnaire) asking them if they have any special problems, and offering limited assistance through the mails. It is suggested that, in future training programs of the short-term variety, plans should provide for immediate follow-up assistance and funds for this should be included in the budget. Evaluation, by itself, is rather hollow and of academic interest, only.

SUMMARY

This training institute, entitled "A Summer Institute for Vocational Counseling and Guidance Personnel" was offered at the State College, Fitchburg, Massachusetts, during the period from 5 July 1966 through 29 July 1966. The purpose of the Institute was to acquaint a broad c ross-section of guidance personnel, chosen from the six New England States plus New York and New Jersey, with the problems and special techniques involved in counseling the typical urban, disadvantaged student. The methods employed in the Institute were lectures, by outstanding authorities in the field such as Drs. Tiedman, Landy, Kvaraceus, and Arbuckle, limited discussion periods, visits to local industry and vocational schools, and actual practice in some of the applicable techniques, such as job analysis. Thirty-four participants completed the program and thirty-three of these responded to an initial questionnaire which requested their reactions and plans for implementation. In general, the participants felt that they had received much benefit from the Institute, but claimed that it had featured too many lecturers, left too little time for discussion and practice, and (by implication) left them sketchily prepared to employ actually the new techniques in school situations. The grantees agree with this estimate, but feel that these defects were unavoidable in a survey-type presentation. Limited assistance will be offered the participants during the next several months, in order to ease this problem. During February of next year, a second questionnaire will be circulated to the participants to assess the impact of the Institute in their local school situations. The results of this survey, as well as the staff's final recommendations, will be included in a second report to be submitted to the grantor by 1 March 1967. Both reports will be combined in a final printed version, along with outstanding lectures from the Institute program, in a booklet which will be distributed to all parties who have been, in any way, involved with the Institute.

APPENDIX

A - List of Lecturers

B - Institute Activity Schedule

C - Participant Application Form

D - Initial Questionnaire Form

E - Chart of Initial Questionnaire Results
(Items of Part A, section 1, matched
with participant reactions)

APPENDIX A

LIST OF LECTURERS

Mr. Walter J. Markham, Director Bureau of Vocational Education

Mr. William J. Sugrue, Deputy Commissioner Economic Development
Massachusetts Department of Commerce

President James J. Hammond, State College, Fitchburg

Dr. Robert P. O'Hara, Boston College

Dr. Thomas E. Christensen, Director of Guidance Services,
Worcester

Mr. Bernard T. White, Director of Guidance, Framingham

Mr. Donald E. Graves, Superintendent-Director, Southeastern
Regional Vocational-Technical School
North Easton

Mr. William A. Dwyer, Superintendent-Director, Blue Hills
Regional Vocational-Technical School, Canton

Dr. William G. Kvaraceus, Tufts University

Dr. Lawrence H. Anderson, Assistant Superintendent of Schools,
Arlington

Mrs. Elizabeth Francis, Supervisor of Testing, Division of
Employment Security, Boston

Miss Maybelle Northcott, Supervisor of Research and Statistics,
Division of Employment Security,Boston

Dr. Edward Landy, Assistant Superintendent, Pupil Personnel
Services, Newton and Professor of Education
Harvard University

Mr. Wallace J. Fletcher, Consultant Technical-Vocational and
Adult Education, Newton Public Schools and
Director of the Ford Foundation Study at
Newton

Dr. David Tiedeman, Harvard University

Mr. Robert Johnson, Social Worker, Arlington Pupil Personnel
Service

Dr. Arthur M. Kroll, Newton, Pupil Personnel Services

Dr. David B. Clemens, Newton, Pupil Personnel Services

Mr. David Callahan, Haverhill Trade School

Mr. Banjamin Wolk, Boston Trade High School

Dr. Everett Garvin, Director of Psychology, Research and Chief of Psychology Service at North Central Mental Health Center, Fitchburg

Dr. Walter English, Guidance Counselor, Springfield Trade High School

Mr. Maurice J. Daly, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Quincy

Mr. Donald K. Tucker, Northeastern University

Dr. Dugald S. Arbuckle, Boston University

Dr. Albert K. Roehrig, Psychologist Phillips Academy, Andover

Dean John C. Palmer, Director of Admissions Tufts University

Mr. Robert C. Laserte, Supervisor of Pupil Personnel Services, Leominster

Mr. Leo C. Renaud, Manpower Coordinator, ABCD, Boston

Dean Richard A. Kelley, College of Special Studies, Tufts University

Dr. Bert A. Roens, Superintendent of Schools, Arlington

Mr. Charles E. Murphy, Director of Guidance, Pittsfield

Mr. Frederick J. Teed, Superintendennt-Director, South Shore Vocational Technical High School

Dean Richard A. Kelley, College of Special Studies and Director of Tufts' Overseas Program

Dr. Bert A. Roens, Superintendent of Schools, Arlington

Dr. Joseph Mindel, Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Lincoln Laboratories, Bedford

Mr. Robert F. Regan, Director of Training Joint Apprentice and Training Committee, Representing the Electrical Contractors Association of Greater Boston and Local 103 International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

Mrs. Teresina Thompson, Assistant Director, Springfield Trade School for Girls, Springfield

Leo F. McManus, Director of Research, J.P. Cleaver Co., Management Consultant, Princeton, N.J.

Mr. Walter B. Dennen, Administrator of Trade-Technical Education, Worcester

Mr. Nicholas Ventrice, Holyoke Trade High School, Graphic Arts Shop Teacher

Mr. Bernholdt Nystrom, Barnstable Vocational High School, Shop Mill Carpentry - Cabinet Making House Building Teacher

Mr. Raymond Noga, Westfield Trade High School, Machine Shop Teacher

Mr. Edward Sliwa, Westfield Trade High School, Shop Electronics Teacher

Mr. James Booth, Superintendent-Director, Greater Lawrence Regional-Vocational Technical School

Mr. Paul Ahearn, Director of Guidance, Greater Lawrence Regional Vocational-Technical School

Mr. Peter Marshall, Assistant Director of Industrial Relations, Norton Co., Worcester

Mr. Edward Farley, Director of Personnel, Heald Machine Co., Worcester

GUIDANCE INSTITUTE

STATE COLLEGE, FITCHBURG, MASSACHUSETTS

JULY 5 TO JULY 29, 1966

ACTIVITY SCHEDULE

FIRST WEEK

DATE / TIME	
Tuesday July 5 9 A.M.–12 Noon	*Registration* — DEAN PHILLIP A. McMURRAY, *Project Director, Fitchburg State College* ***The Philosophy of Vocational Education*** WALTER J. MARKHAM, *Director Bureau of Vocational Education* ***Occupational Opportunities*** WILLIAM J. SUGRUE, *Deputy Commissioner Economic Development Massachusetts Department of Commerce*
1 P.M.–2:30 P.M.	***Technical Talents and Cultural Needs*** PRESIDENT JAMES J. HAMMOND *State College, Fitchburg*
2:30 P.M.–4 P.M.	***Self-Concepts and Interests in Vocational Education*** DR. ROBERT P. O'HARA *Boston College*
Wednesday July 6	Four discussion groups on "What Do I Need to Know As a Counselor about Vocational Education, Placement in School and after School, Jobs in the Future, and Disadvantaged Youth".
9 A.M.–12 Noon	DR. THOMAS E. CHRISTENSEN, *Director of Guidance Services, Worcester* BERNARD T. WHITE, *Director of Guidance Framingham* DONALD E. GRAVES, *Superintendent-Director, Southeastern Regional Vocational-Technical School, North Easton* WILLIAM A. DWYER, *Suprintendent-Director, Blue Hills Regional Vocational-Technical School, Canton*
1 P.M.–4 P.M.	***The Disadvantaged Child*** DR. WILLIAM G. KVARACEUS, *Tufts University* ***A Program for Disadvantaged Youth*** DR LAWRENCE H. ANDERSON, *Assistant Superintendent of Schools Arlington*
Thursday and Friday July 7 and 8 9 A.M.–4 P.M.	At the Norton Company, Manufacturers of Abrasives, Worcester. Job Studies — Each student will be assigned to a worker to make a job analysis of his occupation. Peter Marshall, Assistant Director of Industrial Relations. Lunch will be served at the Norton Company.

SECOND WEEK

DATE TIME	
Monday July 11	Reports and Critiques of Job Analysis at the Norton Company. The Preparation and opportunities for Placement in similar occupations.
9 A.M. – 10 A.M.	JOHN P. MORINE, *Senior Supervisor, Occupational Information and Vocational Guidance, Bureau of Vocational Education, Massachusetts Department of Education*
10 A.M. – 12 Noon	***GATB – the Aptitudes for Occupations*** MRS. ELIZABETH FRANCIS, *Supervisor of Testing, Division of Employment Security, Boston*
	An Analysis of Occupations MISS MAYBELLE NORTHCOTT, *Supervisor of Research and Statistics, Division of Employment Security, Boston*
1 P.M. – 2:30 P.M.	***New Directions in Guidance*** DR. EDWARD LANDY, *Assistant Superintendent, Pupil Personnel Services, Newton and Professor of Education, Harvard University*
2:30 P.M. – 4 P.M.	***Educational and Cultural Implications of Technological Change*** WALLACE J. FLETCHER, *Consultant Technical-Vocational and Adult Education, Newton Public Schools and Director of the Ford Foundation Study at Newton*
Tuesday July 12 9 A.M. – 12 Noon	***The Dictionary of Occupational Titles*** DR. THOMAS E. CHRISTENSEN, *Director of Guidance, Worcester Public Schools*
1 P.M. – 2:30 P.M.	***Dissimination of Occupational Information through Cybernetics*** DR. DAVID V. TIEDEMAN, *Harvard University*
2:30 P.M. – 4 P.M.	***The Role of the Social Worker in Public Schools*** ROBERT JOHNSON, *Social Worker, Arlington Pupil Personnel Service*
Wednesday and Thursday July 13 and 14	At Heald Machine Company, Worcester. Job analysis of occupations in the company. Edward Farley, Director of Personnel.
Friday July 15	***A Career Guidance Occupational Resource Center*** ARTHUR M. KROLL, *Newton, Pupil Personnel Services*
9 A.M. – 12 Noon	***Follow-up Studies of School Leavers*** DAVID B. CLEMENS, *Newton, Pupil Personnel Services* (Both of these studies have been partially funded by the Massachusetts Bureau of Vocational Education under P.L. 88–210, the Vocational Education Act of 1963.)

DATE TIME	
Wednesday July 20 (continued) 11:00 A.M.–12 Noon	**Case Studies –** DEAN RICHARD A. KELLEY, *College of Special Studies, Tufts University* DR. BERT A. ROENS, *Superintendent of Schools, Arlington*
1 P.M.–2:30 P.M.	***Placement Opportunities*** CHARLES E. MURPHY, *Director of Guidance, Pittsfield*
2:30 P.M.–4 P.M.	***Occupational Preparatory Training*** FREDERICK J. TEED, *Superintendent-Director, South Shore Vocational Technical High School*
Thursday July 21	Visit to Worcester Industrial Technical Institute, Walter B. Dennen, Administrator of Trade-Technical Education, Worcester
Friday July 22	
9:00 A.M.–9:45 A.M.	***Higher Education Overseas*** DEAN RICHARD A. KELLEY, *College of Special Studies and Director of Tufts' Overseas Program*
9:45 A.M.–10:30 A.M.	***Vocational Education in the Soviet Union*** DR. BERT A. ROENS, *Superintendent of Schools, Arlington*
10:45 A.M.–12 Noon	***The M.I.T. Conference on Vocational Education*** DR. JOSEPH MINDEL, *Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Lincoln Laboratories, Bedford*

FOURTH WEEK

DATE TIME	
Monday **July 25** **9 A.M. – 4 P.M.**	***Modus Operandi*** — How Youth are trained for occupations. Course and teaching methods. Graphic Arts — NICHOLAS VENTRICE, *Holyoke Trade High School* Carpentry Cabinetmaking, Housebuilding — BERNHOLDT NYSTROM, *Barnstable Vocational H.S.* Machine — RAYMOND NOGA, *Westfield Trade High School* Electronics — EDWARD SLIWA, *Westfield Trade High School*
Tuesday **July 26** **9 A.M. – 4 P.M.**	Shop Application of Vocational Education. The students will complete a project. Projects in the Shop — NICHOLAS VENTRICE, *Holyoke Trade High School, Graphic Arts Shop Teacher* — BERNHOLDT NYSTROM, *Barnstable Vocational High School, Shop Mill Carpentry — Cabinet Making House Building Teacher* — RAYMOND NOGA, *Westfield Trade High School, Machine Shop Teacher* — EDWARD SLIWA, *Westfield Trade High School, Shop Electronics Teacher*
Wednesday **July 27**	Visit to Greater Lawrence Regional Vocational-Technical High School — William Fitzgibbon, Assistant Project Director, James Booth, Superintendent-Director, Greater Lawrence Regional Vocational Technical School and Paul Ahearn, the Director of Guidance, Greater Lawrence Regional Vocational-Technical School.
Thursday **July 28** **9 A.M.–10:30 A.M.**	***Apprentice Training*** ROBERT F. REGAN, *Director of Training Joint Apprentice and Training Committee, Representing the Electrical Contractors Association of Greater Boston and Local 103 International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.*
10:30 A.M.–12 Noon	***Post Graduate Health Occupations*** MRS. TERESINA THOMPSON, *Assistant Director, Springfield Trade High School for Girls, Springfield*
1 P.M.–2:30 P.M.	***The Use of Psychological Tests in Business and Industry*** LEO F. MCMANUS, *Director of Research, J.P. Cleaver Co. Management Consultant Princeton, N.J.*
2:30 P.M. – 4 P.M.	***Reports of Groups and Summerization*** MR. MORINE DEAN FITZGIBBON
Friday **July 29** **9 A.M. – 11 A.M.**	***Final Examination*** MR. MORINE DEAN MCMURRAY DEAN FITZGIBBON

Application for Summer Vocational Counseling and Guidance Institute Fitchburg State College, Fitchburg, Massachusetts July 5 - July 29, 1966

If you meet the eligibility requirements described in the institute brochure and are interested in attending the summer institute, please complete this application and forward it to Dean Philip A. McMurray, Director, Summer Vocational Counseling and Guidance Institute. Fitchburg State College. Fitchburg, Massachusetts, 01420. *All applications should be submitted by June* 1, 1966. *Acceptance notices will be mailed immediately.*

1. Name ..... (Last Name First)

2. Home Address ..... (Street and Number)

..... (City, State, Zip Code)

..... (Telephone)

3. School .....

4. School Address .....

.....

.....

6. Age ..... 7. Marital Status ..... 8. Wife's Name .....

9. No. of dependent children .....

10. School training including high school, college or university, and other schools in special subjects:

Name of School — Location	Major	Dates From	Dates To	No. Months Attendance	Semester Units College Credit	Degree or Diploma

11. **Occupational Experience:**

Name of Employer-Location	Dates From	Dates To	Clock Hours Per Week	Total Number of Weeks	Type of Work

12. **Experience in teaching:**

Name of School or Other Agency-Location	Position or Title	Subjects Taught	Percent of Time of Employment	Date From	Date To	Number Of Months

13. Current teaching area:

a. Subject .....

b. No. of periods (hours) .....

c. Grade .....

d. Second Subject .....

e. No. of periods (hours) .....

f. Grade .....

g. Other school responsibilities .....

.....

14. Will you be teaching the same program in the same school next year? .....

If the answer is no. or you are in doubt, explain. .....

.....

15. Teaching credentials (list):

	Kind	Years Held
a.	.....	.....
b.	.....	.....

APPENDIX D

SUMMER INSTITUTE FOR VOCATIONAL
COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE PERSONNEL
AT
STATE COLLEGE, FITCHBURG, MASSACHUSETTS
(5 July - 29 July 1966)

INITIAL SURVEY OF PARTICIPANTS

The rationale for this initial questionnaire, and the importance of each participant's careful response to it, may be gauged from the following two quotes from the original State College proposal to the U.S. Office of Education:

> Summary of program components - Institute highlights will be:
>
> . . . . . .
>
> 5. Participant recommendations for inclusion in the final report on the institute, polling of participants for initial reactions and individual plans for implementation, and group development of a general survey design through which the Institute staff will assess subsequent impact of the Summer program activities on home-school practices of the participants.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Reports - Two reports will be filed with the funding agency: The first will summarize the activities of the Institute, detail the Staff's conclusions regarding its accomplishments, and will include in tabular form the reactions of the participants and their intentions to pursue implementation of newly acquired ideas in their home schools; The second report, to be submitted approximately six months after the first, will provide information on what the participants claim has been the practical result of what they learned during the Summer, and will further contain recommendations for future guidance institutes and for enhancing the effectiveness of Federal-State collaboration in the guidance venture. Tentative submission dates for these two reports are 1 September 1966, and 1 March 1967, respectively.

In light of the statements immediately above, we are sure you will understand that the questions should be answered thoughtfully and with considerable frankness. Please be assured that none of the questionnaire returns will leave the Institute office, nor will anyone's responses be quoted or otherwise identified by name. However, if you wish, you may detach this sheet from the form before submitting it. Thank you for your cooperation.

NAME_____

HOME ADDRESS_____

_____

PROF. POSITION_____

PROF. ADDRESS_____

_____

QUESTIONNAIRE FORM

Preliminary remarks - Each question should be answered as briefly as possible. If insufficient space has been provided, feel free to write amplifications on a separate sheet, being sure to identify the response by the Part and Question numbers. In some cases, it is necessary to underline words. In all cases, response numbers should reflect their ranking, according to your judgment, in descending order of importance.

PART A - SUMMARY REPORT OF INSTITUTE ACTIVITIES (REPORT #1)

1. Participant Reactions

a. Selection of participants - As is common in institutes of this type, an initial decision which had to be made concerned homogenous versus heterogenous grouping of participants. The latter type of selection was made. Do you feel that this was a wise choice, and what were its advantages and disadvantages from your own point of view?

Ans. _____

Explanation _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

b. Components of Institute

(1) Speakers

There were (too many, enough, too few) for Institute length.

In general, they gave me (too much, enough, too little) information on the subjects, for practical school purposes.

They gave participants (too much, enough, too little) time for informal discussion of points raised during lectures.

(2) Content of Course

The course scope was (too comprehensive, broad enough, too limited)
The level of instruction was (too high, high enough, too low)
The intensity with which the course was pursued was (too strong, manageable, too weak)
Comments _____

_____

_____

(3) Professional Contact

The time allotted to participants for informal discussion, among themselves, was (too great, enough, too little)

The time allotted for participants to discuss points with the lecturers, on an individual or small-group basis, was (too great, enough, too little)
Comments _____

(4) Preparation

Do you feel that you could have achieved more during the institute if you had received advance content material from the Institute staff?

Answer _____

Explanation _____

_____

(5) Visits to Industry

There were (too many, enough, too few) field trips to local industry, for instructional purposes.

The follow-up discussion of these visits was (too long, enough, too short) to fully realize their potential

Explanation _____

_____

c. Utility of Instruction

(1) List the three topics of greatest estimated use to you

_____

_____

(2) List the three topics of least estimated use to you

_____

_____

(3) List three aspects of the Vocational Guidance Counselor's role which have either more or less importance for you as a result of your attendance at the Institute. Note whether (M) or (L) and explain briefly.

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. Plans for Implementation of Ideas and Techniques

List, in outline form, the ways in which (or the mechanisms by which) you plan to implement any of the ideas or techniques you have gained from Institute instruction. (additional space on following page)

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. Plans for Dissemination of Institute Outcomes

a. Participant

What do you think would be the most effective ways in which you could share or spread information you have received in the Institute, in your own locale?

b. Institute Staff

What do you think would be the most effective means by which the Institute staff might disseminate the outcomes of the Summer session, on a wider (i.e. regional or national) basis?

4. Suggestions for Improving the Institute

Please list the ways in which the Institute might be improved, in any respect, and with particular emphasis on helping counselors to the disadvantaged student.

PART B - FIELD SURVEY AND FINAL CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS (REPORT) #2)

We would appreciate your suggestions on pertinent questions which you feel the Institute should ask each participant to determine, in about four months' time, what the practical results have been in each school situation. The question categories have been chosen, as follows:

1. Regarding impact on individual counselor-participant:

2. Regarding impact on school situation:

_____

_____

_____

3. Regarding advantages or disadvantages of various techniques:

_____

_____

_____

4. Regarding possible impediments to full and successful information of new methods. (This should reflect individual counselor-participant's previous experience with "blockages" of several kinds - staff, financial, political, etc.):

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR HELP

RETURN IN ONE WEEK TO:

DEAN PHILIP A. McMURRAY, DIRECTOR
U.S.O.E. GUIDANCE INSTITUTE
STATE COLLEGE AT FITCHBURG
FITCHBURG, MASSACHUSETTS

APPENDIX E

CHART OF INITIAL QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

No.	State	Prof. Pos.	Type School	Deg.	Add. Sem. Hours	Teach. Exp.Yr.	Type Cert.	1 Y	1 N	2 a	2 b	2 c	3 a	3 b	3 c	4 a	4 b	4 c	5 a	5 b	5 c	6 a	6 b	6 c	7 a	7 b	7 c	8 a	8 b	8 c	9 a	9 b	9 c	10 Y	10 N	11 a	11 b	11 c	12 a	12 b	12 c
1	Vt.	T-IA	CHS	B	21	13	T-IA	*		*			*					*	*			*			*				*			*		*		*			*	
2	Mass.	GC	AHS	M	15	11	T-GC	*		*					*			*	*			*			*				*			*			*			*	
3	Mass.	T-GC	JHS	B	34	5	T-GC	*		*				*		*			*			*			*				*		*				*			*	
4	Vt.	T-GC	AHS	B	1	4	T-GC	*			*			*			*		*			*			*			*				*		*			*		
5	Vt.	P-GD	AHS	M	0	6	T	*		*				*			*		*			*			*			*				*			*				*	
6	Vt.	GD	VHS	M	0	12	T	*		*			*			*			*			*			*				*		*			M		M			M	
7	Mass.	T	AHS	M	88	19	T-GC	*		*					*			*	*			*			*				*			*		*		*			*	
8	Mass.	GC	AHS	M	18	30	T-GC	*		*			*			*			*			*			*				*			*			*			*	
9	Mass.	T	JHS	B	0	2	T	*			*		*				*		*			*			*			*				*		*			*		
10	Conn.	GD	AHS	M	27	7	GC	*		*					*			*	*			*			*				*			*		*					*	
11	Mass.	GC	MDTA	B	39	2	T-GC	Questionnaire missing																																	
12	Vt.	GD	AHS	M	42	3	GC		*	*					*			*	*			*			*				*			*			*				*	
13	N.J.	GC	JHS	M	0	2	T-GC	*		*					*			*	*			*			*				*			*		*				*	
14	Mass.	GD	AHS	M	Some	3	T-GC	*		*					*			*	*			*			*				*			*			*			*	
15	N.J.	T-GC	AHS	M	9	26	T-GC	*		*					*			*	*			*			*				*			*		*				*	
16	Conn.	T-GC	AHS	M	0	15	T-Adm.	*		*			*					*	*			*			*				*			*		*				*	
17	Mass.	GD	AHS	M	0	10	T-Psy.	*		*					*			*	*			*			*				*			*			*			*	
18	Mass.	GC	JHS	M	0	4	T-GC	*		*				M				*	*			*			*				*			*		M		M			M	
19	Mass.	T-GC	AHS	M	3	4	T-SE	*		*					*			*	*			*			M				*			*			*			*	
20	Mass.	GC	VHS	M	11	10	V-GC	*		*					*			*	*			*			*				*			*			*			*	
21	Mass.	GC	AHS	M	15	13	None	*		*				*		*			*			*			*				*			*			*			*	
22	Mass.	GC	JHS	M	33	11	T	*		*					*			*	*			*			*				*			*			*			*	
23	Mass.	T	VHS	M	51	17	V-T	*		*			*					*	*			*			*				*			*		*				*	
24	Mass.	T	VHS	M	Some	13	T-GD	*			*			*				*	*			*			*			*				*			*			*	
25	Mass.	T	VHS	B	12+Curr.	8	V	*			*		*					*	*			*			*			*				*			*			*	
26	Mass.	T-GC	PHS	- Missing-				*			*				*			*	*			*			*				*			*			*			*	
27	Minn.	T-GC	PHS	M	0	40	T-GC	*		*			*					*	*			*			*				*			*			*			*	
28	Conn.	GC	AHS	M	35	6	T	*		*					*			*	*			*			*				*			*		*				*	
29	Mass.	GC	AHS	D	23	15	T-GC-Adm.	*		*			*					*	*			*			*				*			*			*			*	
30	Mass.	GC	JHS	B	18	2	T	*			*			*				*	*			*			*			*				*			*			*	
31	Mass.	GC	VHS	M	0	15	T-V	*		*					*			*	*			*			*				*			*			*			*	
32	Vt.	P	AHS	M	3	13	T-IA-Adm.	*		*					*			*	*			*			*				*			*			*			*	
33	Mass.	T-GC	PHS	B	Some	27	T	*		*					*			*	*			*			*				*			*			*			*	
34	Mass.	T-GC	VHS	M	6	16	T	*		*					*			*	*			*			*				*			*			*			*	
TOTALS								32	1	27	6	0	1	16	15	0	5	28	1	32	0	0	31	1	7	25	1	0	9	24	0	6	27	19	12	1	23	7	8	14	9

LEGEND

Prof. Pos. - Professional Position
- GC - Guidance Counselor
- GD - Guidance Director
- IA - Industrial Arts
- P - Principal
- T - Teacher

Type School
- AHS - Academic High School
- CHS - Comprehensive High School
- JHS - Junior High School
- MDTA- Mass. Dev. of Employment Security
- PHS - Private High School
- VHS - Vocational High School

Type Cert. - Type Certificate
- T-ADM - Teacher; Administrator
- T-PSY - Teacher; Psychologist
- T-GC - Teacher; Guidance Counselor
- T-IA - Teacher; Industrial Arts
- V - Vocational Teacher
- T-SE - Teacher; Special Ed.

Responses
- a - too much
- b - adequate
- c - too few
- Y - yes
- N - no
- M - missing